

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2001/04/24 : CIA-RDP78A0718A001200090003-8
~~SECRET~~

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Document No. | 003 |
| No Change In Class. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Declassified | |
| Class. Changed To: | TS S <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Auth.: | HR 70-2 |
| Date: | NOV 30 1978 By: O'3 |

25X1A9a MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. [REDACTED]

SUBJECT : Comments on the Attached Proposed Notice and Amended Regulation

1. With respect to the Proposed Amendment of Regulation [REDACTED] (1A)

a. Paragraph 4.c.(5)

I have no objection to this change. Someone must assume initiative and responsibility for determining these matters. I can only hope that the Assistant Director for Personnel will take full cognizance of the desires of the offices most concerned with respect to any single position for which he determines the normal progression.

b. Paragraph 5.a.

As [REDACTED] indicated earlier to you this seems logical.

2. Proposed Notice No. [REDACTED]

a. It is recommended that we drop all use of grade GS-10. Thus, grade GS-9 would be the beginning of the major salary jumps. From 9 to 11 would be approximately an \$800 increase, from 11 to 12 would be an \$1100 increase, from 12 to 13 would be a \$1400 increase, etc. It is not believed necessary to extend the smaller (\$400) increases beyond grade GS-9. Grade GS-9 would become the jumping off point.

b. The argument presented in the present program does not apply to grade GS-8. I believe there remains a need for this grade. There are for example, mail or file clerk supervisors who, because of the scope of their work, should be given a higher grade than GS-7 but not as high as GS-9. The grade GS-8 fits in nicely with the regular increments of salary given to that "non-professional" group of workers whose increases are based essentially on being responsible for more and more (quantity) work.

c. In accordance with the above, I would recommend that paragraph 3.a. of the proposed notice be amended to read "during the range GS-5 to GS-9." This same change would apply to paragraph 1 of the proposed notice.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Approved For Release 2001/04/24 : CIA-RDP78A0718A001200090003-8
~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL

25X1A9a

d. With respect to the list of positions in paragraph 3.a., I have only one change to recommend. It is that the Intelligence Assistant (GS-0301.26) should be removed from this list and added to the list in paragraph 3.b. The Intelligence Assistant, in many cases, can not be distinguished from the Administrative Assistant. I have discussed this on several occasions with Mr. [REDACTED] and he has consistently agreed with me. He was surprised to see the Intelligence Assistant listed under paragraph 3.a.

e. No comment on paragraph 3.b. except that it should include the Intelligence Assistant.

f. No comment on paragraph 3.c.

g. We are not required to comment on the voluminous staff study material attached to the proposed issuances.

3. As a general comment, I endorse the establishment of such controls as the proposed notice will create. This system of controls and guide lines is badly needed.

[REDACTED] 25X1A9a

SA-DD/A:DST:dlc (10 Dec 54)

Distribution:

1-chrono
1 - subject
1-DST

~~SECRET~~ CONFIDENTIAL